

**SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP COMMENTS**  
**TRACY, CA**

<i>Date:</i>	<b>June 16, 2005</b> 1:00-5:00 pm	<i>Location:</i>	<b>Tracy</b> Tracy Community Center 400 East 10th Street
<i>Meeting Purpose and Goals:</i>	To hear and record public comment on the Public Review Draft of the California Water Plan Update 2005		
<i>All meeting materials, including the PowerPoint presentation, are available at the California Water Plan website at: <a href="http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/materials/index.cfm">http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/materials/index.cfm</a></i>			

**Presenters:**

**Gina Bartlett**, Facilitator, Center for Collaborative Policy, CA State University, Sacramento  
**Marci Coglianese**, Advisory Committee member, League of California Cities  
**Fran Garland**, Advisory Committee member, Contra Costa Water District  
**Kamyar Guivetchi**, Program Manager, CA Department of Water Resources (DWR)  
**Karl Winkler**, District Chief, Central District, DWR

**Introduction: Format and Purpose**

Gina Bartlett, meeting facilitator, introduced the presenters and DWR staff and welcomed everyone to the CA Water Plan Update 2005 Public Input Workshop in Tracy. She thanked the City of Tracy for providing the meeting facility. The purpose of the meeting was for the CA Department of Water Resources (DWR) to receive public input and to share ideas for the Public Review Draft of the CA Water Plan.

The workshop format was interactive. The meeting consisted of 3 presentations by Kamyar Guivetchi (DWR), followed by group discussion at each table. Advisory Committee members Marci Coglianese and Fran Garland spoke on behalf of the CA Water Plan Update 2005 Advisory Committee, and DWR Central District Chief Karl Winkler gave a presentation on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Regional Report, which is located in Volume 3 of the CA Water Plan. Participants sat in table groups. Each table station had a DWR staff person who helped record the group discussion on a flipchart. Each table group chose a reporter among themselves who would report back flipchart notes to the entire audience on behalf of the group. Near the end of the meeting, time was reserved to orally present prepared statements. For detailed description of the format, see the “Working in Groups” handout.

**Part 1 – Agenda Items A and B**

**A) Background & Overview / B) Comments from the Advisory Committee**

This *Water Plan Update* is different than previous updates. It was prepared using a new process. There are many new features in the Water Plan. It will be continually updated as new information becomes available, and it presents a strategic plan and framework for action developed with substantial stakeholder input. Kamyar Guivetchi spoke on the process of the Water Plan. Advisory Committee member Fran Garland described the extensive 4-and-a-half-year collaborative process that involved the Tracy Workshop Comments – June 16, 2005

diverse 65-member stakeholder Advisory Committee meeting many times in full-day meetings, small focused workshops, and interest-based caucus groups. She complimented DWR on making the current draft of the Water Plan a compromise of the many interests represented by the Advisory Committee. Marci Coglianese explained the *Advisory Committee View*, a 4-page handout that summarizes the wide areas of agreement and disagreement among the Advisory Committee over the last four and a half years, and the remaining areas of uncertainty. Ms. Coglianese stated her support of the Water Plan's efforts to bring understanding of water issues to land use planners, and urged members of the public to make use of the open process and give their input to DWR during the public comment period, which ends on July 22.

Below is a summary of the comments made at the tables:

*Thinking about the presentation on Background and Overview by DWR and Comments from the Advisory Committee, what are the things you:*

Liked	Would Change	Don't Know, Have Questions About:
<p><b>Table 1:</b> No comments.</p> <p><b>Table 2:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ Inclusive process.</li> <li>+ Document is a wealth of information.</li> <li>+ Cordial relations between the Advisory Committee and DWR.</li> </ul> <p><b>Table 3:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ Facilitation was good.</li> <li>+ Promoting a <u>regional</u> approach is good for the management of surface water and groundwater</li> </ul> <p><b>Table 4:</b> No comments.</p>	<p><b>Table 1:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Δ Need more specifics on what needs to be done, whether development or farming?</li> <li>Δ Can DWR include a lesson learned from implementations of previous plans (as a section of the document)?</li> </ul> <p><b>Table 2:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Δ Process must get rid of preconceived notions.</li> <li>Δ Recommendation of more surface water storage needs to be included.</li> </ul> <p>Δ Need more provisions to capture water.</p> <p><b>Table 3:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Δ Would like to see storage addressed.</li> <li>Δ Include recommendations for what the federal government should do.</li> <li>Δ The state should consider purchasing the federal water facilities in California.</li> </ul> <p><b>Table 4:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Δ Needs a comprehensive analysis of environmental water use efficiency.</li> <li>Δ Needs more discussion of consequences of loss of food supply from drought.</li> <li>Δ Add a drought scenario.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Table 1:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No mandates – how is this a useful document?</li> <li>• Why did it take 4.5 years to make this Water Plan? Why is DWR starting over again?</li> <li>• Reinventing the wheel with a new Advisory Committee next year...</li> <li>• How do you provide a regional management system when it could conflict with a statewide system?</li> </ul> <p><b>Table 2:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water Plan doesn't provide water to avoid groundwater overdraft.</li> <li>• DWR doesn't have the power to mandate but does have the power to address the need.</li> <li>• How are we going to meet the need of 1/3 more people in 2030?</li> <li>• Greater water supply reliability does not mean greater water supply.</li> <li>• Allocation of water shell game</li> <li>• This County (San Joaquin) worked hard to get legislative law passed (Agricultural Code 411)</li> <li>• Serious that DWR decided not to listen to this law – we can't wait for another 10 year Update to address this issue.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regions need to be involved, but there is no way any one region can decide if the water supply is adequate for all regions</li> <li>• In summer, rivers are often too low even to irrigate with</li> <li>• Why is so much emphasis on agricultural water conservation? What about cities conserving water?</li> </ul> <p><b>Table 3:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achilles Heel is the funding and coordination among state agencies</li> <li>• We haven't had a major on-stream dam constructed in over 50 years in California</li> <li>• Too much water allocated for fish and other environmental uses. Not enough water is left in storage for people to use (e.g. New Melones River)</li> <li>• The State Water Project operation should be managed by an agency separate from DWR</li> <li>• The population in California is growing faster than the developed water supply. This plan does not do enough to address this.</li> </ul> <p><b>Table 4:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who suffers most during a drought?</li> <li>• CALFED ignores the Delta levees.</li> <li>• Although the Water Plan doesn't have clout from a legislative standpoint, legislative staffers read the plan to determine the law.</li> </ul>
--	--	--

#### Question of Clarification & Answer:

*Q: If it took 4.5 years to make this Water Plan Update, why start the process over again?*

A: The California Water Code explicitly requires DWR to update the Water Plan every five years. Also, we are keeping the idea of a strategic document; the world around us keeps changing, so the Plan should adjust. We don't have to recreate the document every time, but we want to continually reexamine whether changes need to be made. DWR with input from the Advisory Committee made a Tracy Workshop Comments – June 16, 2005

lot of foundational changes in this Water Plan, with the features discussed in the PowerPoint presentation. We intend to build on this foundation and not start from square one.

*Q: What are lessons learned from previous Water Plan Updates?*

A: That is a question we have heard many times. It is a reason why the Implementation Plan (Volume 1, Chapter 5) has performance measures to track what has happened between this Water Plan; what went well and what we should do differently.

## Part 2 – Agenda Items C and D

### C) California Water Today & Water Balance / D) Regional Reports

It is important for a strategic plan to have a clear description of current conditions and situations. Chapter 3 of Volume 1: Strategic Plan is called “California Water Today.” As the largest chapter in Volume 1 (about 120 pages), it is intended to provide education and reference information. It gives general findings from both statewide and regional perspectives as well as the perspectives of different water use sectors (agriculture, urban, and environment). Volume 3 of the Water Plan has more detailed information on each of the 10 hydrologic regions (plus additional reports for Statewide, Mountain Counties, and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta), covering conditions, challenges, accomplishments, and future opportunities of the Region presented, as well as quantified water balances for supply and use. Kamyar Guivetchi presented the California Water today and statewide water balances, and Central District Chief Karl Winkler presented the Volume 3 regional reports for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta region.

Below is a summary of the comments made at the tables in response to these questions::

*Thinking about the presentation on Background and Overview by DWR and Comments from the Advisory Committee, what are the things you:*

Liked	Would Change	Don't Know, Have Questions About:
<p><b>Table 1:</b></p> <p>+ Liked ongoing studies, especially the mercury study.</p> <p><b>Table 3:</b></p> <p>+ The Water Plan is a good resource but <u>everything</u> is subject to debate.</p> <p><b>Table 4:</b></p> <p>+ New technology available to find faults in levees</p>	<p><b>Table 1:</b></p> <p>Δ Need to have discussion of plans to develop on-stream water storage.</p> <p>Δ Describe how data was collected and who did it.</p> <p><b>Table 2:</b></p> <p>Δ Add a “Challenge” for how we are going to provide additional food for additional people.</p> <p>Δ Delta Regional Report adequately describes water conditions but doesn't come to conclusions on what is to be done.</p> <p>Δ Need to analyze what happens when there are multiple dry years – not just a single dry year</p> <p>Δ The Plan should relate to the</p>	<p><b>Table 1:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The resource management strategies seem to be overlapping.</li> <li>• Are agricultural water conservation savings going to the cities?</li> <li>• We spent a lot of money, but we aren't getting any water.</li> <li>• What are the performance metrics for completed or on-going studies? Does the public get its money's worth?</li> </ul> <p><b>Table 2:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Much of the Water Plan relies on CALFED data – many people in the Delta have problems with CALFED solutions</li> </ul>

	<p>question and the need to fill that storage with water that would otherwise be lost</p> <p>Δ Indicate that 90% of contamination comes from storm drains, not farmers</p> <p><b>Table 4:</b></p> <p>Δ Under CVPIA, no water for 2 million acres for the next drought – please add this</p> <p>Δ It should be made crystal clear whether the Plan is complying with the law (regarding food supply).</p> <p>Δ Plan should emphasize less reliance on water imports from Northern California and more reliance on own regions and strategies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reclamation Districts have their hands tied so that can't fix levies, but they are still held accountable.</li> <li>• Metropolitan Water District of Southern CA controls everything</li> <li>• People upstream get the short end of the stick.</li> <li>• Habitat exists because residents allowed it to grow</li> </ul> <p><b>Table 3:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the process by which the Water Plan affects / impacts policy?</li> <li>• During a drought...urban areas get the water</li> <li>• Advisory Committee participants have disagreements about the potential water conservation and other estimates/projections</li> <li>• 300 cfs of additional flow would improve the dissolved oxygen problem near Stockton</li> </ul> <p><b>Table 4:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amount of paperwork, time and money to get permission to fix problems in the Delta is too high</li> <li>• Storage should be a priority</li> <li>• Is the Plan complying with the law (regarding food supply)?</li> </ul>
--	--	--

### Part 3 – Agenda Items E and F

#### E) Preparing for the Future (Scenarios) / F) Diversifying Responses (Strategies)

This *Water Plan Update 2005* recognizes that many things may alter water use and supplies between now and 2030. For that reason, the *Update* contains a description of three plausible yet different future scenarios. Uncertainty about future course of events creates a need for multiple options to address opportunities and challenges. Further, the Plan recognizes that one size does not fit all regions of the state. Each region will have specific requirements or needs that may not apply across the entire state. Implementing multiple options (diverse management strategies) allows water planners and managers to adapt to a variety of circumstances. Volume 2 (Resource Management Strategies) has narrative descriptions for 25 different management strategies available to help them reduce water demand, improve operational efficiency and transfers, increase water supply, improve water quality, and practice resource stewardship.

Below is a summary of the comments made by individuals at the tables in response to these questions:

*Thinking from the perspective of 2030 are there things about this approach to plan for the future you:*

Liked	Would Change	Don't Know, Have Questions About:
<p><b>Table 1:</b></p> <p>+ As far as Water Plans go, this was an inclusive Water Plan.</p>	<p><b>Table 1:</b></p> <p>Δ Add discussion about water rights.</p> <p><b>Table 2:</b></p> <p>Δ Distinguish between applied water and consumed water</p> <p>Δ None of the scenarios assumes we are going to need more food.</p> <p>Δ Strategies such as transoceanic water bags are unrealistic.</p> <p>Δ Issues with using drip irrigation to save water. It's not always as good as we thought – it creates a salt ring, reduces applied water and increases consumption.</p> <p><b>Table 3:</b></p> <p>Δ There needs to be a greater commitment to desalination near the Coast</p>	<p><b>Table 1:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DWR said that they will “work with agencies”...what does that mean?</li> <li>• Where does the Water Plan go from here?</li> <li>• The Advisory Committee said that DWR did not have modeling tools...yet we have modeling results in the draft Water Plan. How?</li> <li>• How does this Water Plan compare with the planning efforts of other large water agencies (i.e. East Bay Municipal Utilities District).</li> </ul> <p><b>Table 2:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agricultural water use efficiency means you don't recharge to the groundwater and don't recycle it</li> <li>• The Water Plan continues to take us down the path of dependency of imported food and associated national security risks.</li> <li>• How will the implementation of urban water use efficiency measures be handled?</li> <li>• Numbers that add up to a 3% in water supply for 33% more people are not realistic.</li> </ul> <p><b>Table 3:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The scenarios include a lot of assumptions that are unrealistic</li> <li>• The potential for improvement in water use efficiency in the Delta are minimal because of the soils and the water table</li> <li>• How far should the Water Plan go to estimate the costs of the resource management strategies?</li> <li>• How can you maintain the health of the Delta if exports increase?</li> <li>• Desalination is the true long term solution because it is new water.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New subdivisions should have separate water systems for reuse.</li> </ul> <p><b>Table 4:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned with numbers using less than 2.0 af/acre in the Delta for agriculture in Karl Winkler’s presentation</li> <li>• We keep asking agriculture to conserve and don’t recognize how far agricultural water efficiency has come.</li> <li>• We need storage – underground, above ground, etc.</li> <li>• There are too many rules and regulations</li> <li>• Try to do anything and you get sued.</li> </ul>
--	--	---

#### **Part 4 – Formal Public Comments** (in order of presentation):

Members of the public were welcome to present statements in the formal style of a traditional public hearing. Four members of the public were registered for speaker comments:

##### **Ray Latimer, Stockton East Water District:**

Mr. Latimer stated his belief that the California Water Plan should address the need for more surface storage, for several reasons. The first reason is global warming. He described that global warming is a changing, cyclical condition, like the ups and downs of the stock market. He stressed that it is important to be ready to address the impacts of climate change.

Mr. Latimer emphasized the benefits of surface storage to prepare for the demands of an increasing population. In order to have sufficient water in the future, we need to start building surface storage facilities now to catch the water to provide food and drinking water for increased population. He said that the population will rise from 34 million to 50 million people; it’s a “no brainer” that we need more water. We won’t get the water through conservation.

The third reason for surface storage is the problem of the multi-year droughts; Mr. Latimer said he had lived long enough to have experienced several of them. They were not fun; he had seen Woodward Reservoir go dry in the late 1970’s, and it remained dry for a couple years. Surface storage is needed to provide reserves for extreme drought conditions. He thanked DWR for the opportunity to speak.

##### **Alex Hildebrand:**

Before criticizing the Water Plan, Mr. Hildebrand stated that there is a wealth of information in the Water Plan document. Mr. Hildebrand had served on the Water Plan Advisory Committee as a representative of both the San Joaquin Farm Bureau and the South Delta Water Agency. He submitted

on their behalf a four page critique of the Plan, which is posted on the Water Plan website. Basically, the problem comes down to the refusal of the Water Plan to address the question of food supply. It takes more water to grow the food for each person than it does to take care of all the person's other needs – that is a scientifically necessary situation that will not change. This was ignored when developing the Plan. Mr. Hildebrand brought up that the issue was being ignored and proposed that DWR include a reference to other documents that demonstrate that it is scientifically not possible to produce a lot more food without consuming a lot more water. If the water is not consumed in the Central Valley, it almost all is reused within the Valley. DWR refused to add those references; this was not just an oversight.

Mr. Hildebrand stated there are credible estimates that show that producing food and other essential agricultural products consumes about three-quarters of an acre foot of water for each person in the population. On that basis, if California's population rises by 12 million more people, we would need 8 million acre feet of water just to grow the food. Since the Water Plan does not account for that, the result is that we will have to import our food. There is nothing in the document that calls attention to fact that in 25 years there will be a billion-and-a-half more people worldwide competing for food. We are currently feeding the world's population by overdrafting groundwater all over the world, including in California and on to Ogallala Basin in the Midwest. Estimates for the World Watch Institute are that about a sixth of the current food supply derives from that unsustainable overdraft of groundwater.

Mr. Hildebrand submitted written comments which are posted on the CA Water Plan Public Comments website at <http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/comments/update2005/prdcomments.cfm>

**Mike Robinson, San Joaquin County Farm Bureau:**

Mr. Robinson emphasized that the state must realize that we need more, real storage – more dams, not just a dam. We need 2 to 5 to 8 million more acre feet of water. He was concerned with what he felt were unusual conclusions and remedies in the Water Plan. One of them is to use dry land farming, and yet we're supposed to provide food and fiber for one-third more people in the state with at best only 10% less water. Between Sacramento and San Joaquin Counties, one of the scenarios is to take out of production 700,000 acres of irrigated farmland without any economic impact to the area. There are some very strange, incredible assumptions being made in this document. There is a lot of water that goes out to the ocean that could be utilized that is not needed or figured in for environmental purposes or urban or agricultural uses during high water outfall times. We need to capture more of that water. Mr. Robinson thanked DWR for the opportunity to speak.

**Dante Nomellini, Jr., Central Delta Water Agency and Reclamation District #17:**

Mr. Nomellini announced that Central Delta Water Agency fully supports the detailed comments submitted by Alex Hildebrand and the Farm Bureau. He stated that Alex Hildebrand's comments are about requirements expressly set forth in the law of what this Plan needs to include regarding the food supply and not allowing the state to become a net importer of food. At an absolute minimum, that topic should be thoroughly covered. The Legislature deemed it important enough to put it into law; the Central Delta Water Agency urges DWR to take this issue seriously.

Mr. Nomellini was also concerned about how the California Water Plan would address future water supplies. He stated that people in the Central Delta and South Delta are burdened by the tremendous export of water from the Delta to Southern California. The fish are in bad shape, so bad that it is difficult for reclamation districts to work on levees because of potential impacts to the fish. There is a



limit to how much water can be drained from this system. Central Delta Water Agency has been urging that the areas in the Southern California become more self-sufficient. They need to reduce their need to take water from Northern California because there is a limit to it. They are entitled to take what is extra but it is now debatable whether there is anything extra. The Water Plan shows that there is a tremendous opportunity for desalination, recycling, conservation. Mr. Nomellini acknowledged that there are issues with desalination, but he urged that the Water Plan tell areas in Southern California to generate their own supplies via the ocean or by cleaning up brackish groundwater. Mr. Nomellini thanked DWR for the opportunity to comment.

## **Part 5 – Closing**

Kamyar thanked the audience for participating in the public comment workshop and for their comments. He reminded everyone that the public review period will last through July 22, to allow for 60 days since the release of the printed Public Review Draft document.

The final comment deadline is July 22.

## **Attendance:**

### **Public:**

Craig W. Anderson, Farm Bureau News  
Dana Nichols, The Record  
Anthony Barkett, Stockton East Water District  
Steve Bayley, City of Tracy  
Bob Broware, Tracy Press  
Marci Coglianese, League of California Cities  
Zafer Demir  
Robert Ferguson  
Colleen Foster, League of Women Voters  
Betty Galli, Homestead Land and Water Alliance  
Louis Galli  
Fran Garland, Contra Costa Water District  
Alex Hildebrand  
Barbara Hildebrand  
Mary Hildebrand  
Andrea Larkin  
Westord Ray Latimer, Stockton East Water District  
Vincent Marchini, Marchini Agriculture  
Mike Martinez, Tri Valley Herald  
Larry Miller, Farm Bureau  
Toni Miller, Farm Bureau  
Dana Nichols, The Record  
Dante Nomellini, Central Delta Water Agency  
Robert Raspo, Raspo Farming  
Mike Robinson, San Joaquin County Farm Bureau  
Jerry Robinson, South Delta Water Agency  
Michael Viera  
Tracy Workshop Comments – June 16, 2005

**Staff:**

Alan Aguilar, DWR  
Gina Bartlett, CCP  
Paul Dabbs, DWR  
Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR  
Jennifer Kofoid, DWR  
Paul Massera, DWR  
Michael Perrone, DWR  
Matt Nolberg, DWR  
David Sumi, CCP  
Evelyn Tipton, DWR  
Karl Winkler, DWR  
Jean Woods, DWR  
David Sumi, CCP